Marcus Belton United States Penitentiary 3901 Klein Blvd. Lompoc, CA 93436-2706



Pro Se Defendant

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

USA	) Case Number: 4:14-cr-00030-JST-1
Plaintiff,	) NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER [ECF NOS. 316 -
vs.	) 09/26/2019] BY A PERSON IN FEDERAL
MARCUS BELTON	) CUSTODY OR IN ALTERNATIVE ) GRANT CERTIFICATE OF APPEAL
Defendant.	) FILED CONCURRENTLY INFORMAL ) BRIEF [MEMORANDUM OF POINTS ) AND AUTHORITIES] AND ) DECLARATION

### NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

 Now comes, Defendant/Movant, Marcus Belton, pro se by and through the record requesting due process and submits as follows:

### **CURRENT DOCKET STATUS**

- Defendant filed [ECF 323] the motion on March 17, 2020, arguing that he never received
  notice of the habeas order or accompanying judgment and only learned of their issuance
  when the Ninth Circuit denied his mandamus petition. ECF No. 323.
- 3. On 04/23/2020 Hon'ble Court ordered:

Accordingly, the Court now ORDERS THE UNITED STATES TO SHOW CAUSE why the Court should not vacate and reenter its judgment dated October 4, 2019. The government's written opposition, if any, is due April 30, 2020. If no opposition is filed, the Court will vacate judgment and reenter it on May 22, 2020, after the likely conclusion of Belton's illness and quarantine, to allow Belton 30 days from that date to file a notice of appeal. If an opposition is filed, Belton may file a response to that opposition by June 22, 2020.

4. No opposition has been filed by Plaintiff.

#### **DELAY DUE TO COVID-10**

- 5. Defendant Marcus Belton cannot comply with his current appellate deadlines because he is infected with COVID-19 and under quarantine. Moreover, if Belton were to attempt to comply with those deadlines, his preparation and delivery of his legal paperwork would place fellow inmates, prison staff, and the public at large at greater risk of infection. Under these "extraordinary circumstances," the Court has the authority vacate and reenter judgment in order to allow Belton the opportunity to appeal. Mackey v. Hoffman, 682 F.3d 1247, 1253-54 (9th Cir. 2012).
- 6. Therefore Beltons' filing may or may not be in time. Please condone delay (if any.)

#### MOTION TO RECONSIDER

- 7. The Court has discretion to reconsider and vacate a prior order. Barber v. Hawaii, 42 F.3d 1185, 1198 (9th Cir. 1994); United States v. Nutri-cology, Inc., 982 F.2d 394, 396 (9th Cir. 1992). Motions to reconsider are committed to the discretion of the trial court. Combs v. Nick Garin Trucking, 825 F.2d 437, 441 (D.C. Cir. 1987); Rodgers v. Watt, 722 F.2d 456, 460 (9th Cir. 1983) (en banc). To succeed, a party must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision. See Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield, 634 F.Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 1986), affirmed in part and reversed in part on other grounds, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987).
- 8. Belton has concurrently field an "Informal Brief" along with this "motion for reconsideration" to show that new or different facts or circumstances claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion, or other grounds exist for the motion.
- Moreover, previously Appellate Court was not presented with all the Appealable issues.
   To enable Appellate Court, have complete understanding of issue at hand, Belton hereby files
  - a. a Motion to Reconsider ECF 316 [Order dated 09/26/2019]
  - b. Informal Brief attached to Motion to Reconsider.

## GRANT CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

10. If Court denies this Motion to Reconsider, then Belton further requests this Court to please Grant certificate of Appealability (In Alternative.)

Rule 22. Habeas Corpus and Section 2255 Proceedings

- (b) Certificate of Appealability.
- (1) In a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises from process issued by a state court, or in a 28 U.S.C. §2255 proceeding, the applicant cannot take an appeal unless a circuit justice or a circuit or district judge issues a certificate of appealability under 28 U.S.C. §2253(c). If an applicant files a notice of appeal, the district clerk must send to the court of appeals the certificate (if any) and the statement described in Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Proceedings Under 28 U.S.C. §2254 or §2255 (if any), along with the notice of appeal and the file of the district-court proceedings. If the district judge has denied the certificate, the applicant may request a circuit judge to issue it.
- 11. Defendant Preserves his Right to Appeal while this Motion to Reconsider and Request for Grant of Certificate of Appealability is pending

Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure provides:

- (4) Effect of a Motion on a Notice of Appeal.
- (A) If a party files in the district court any of the following motions under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—and does so within the time allowed by those rules—the time to file an appeal runs for all parties from the entry of the order disposing of the last such remaining motion:.....

/s/ MARCUS BELTON

MARCUS BELTON

Defendant

# STATE OF CALIFORNIA

#### COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

## AFFIDAVIT/ DECLARATION OF MARCUS BELTON

This Affidavit is submitted in support of Defendants Motion for Reconsideration with attached Informal Brief and Request for Certificate of Appealability

I Defendant never received notice of the habeas order or accompanying judgment and only learned of their issuance when the Ninth Circuit denied his mandamus petition. ECF No. 323.

I cannot comply with his current appellate deadlines because I am/ was infected with COVID-19 and under quarantine.

Upon information and belief, this Court has discretion to reconsider.

The Court has discretion to reconsider and vacate a prior order. Barber v. Hawaii, 42 F.3d 1185, 1198 (9th Cir. 1994); United States v. Nutri-cology, Inc., 982 F.2d 394, 396 (9th Cir. 1992).

Motions to reconsider are committed to the discretion of the trial court.

Combs v. Nick Garin Trucking, 825 F.2d 437, 441 (D.C. Cir. 1987); Rodgers v.

Watt, 722 F.2d 456, 460 (9th Cir. 1983) (en banc).

I have set forth [in Informal Brief] all facts and law of strongly convincing nature to induce the Court to reverse the prior decision.

To succeed, a party must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision. See Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield, 634 F.Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 1986), affirmed in part and reversed in part on other grounds, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987).

I have concurrently field an "Informal Brief" along with this "motion for reconsideration" to show that new or different facts or circumstances claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion, or other grounds exist for the motion.

97 Cus Belton 9890301 1230 hayes St 100 Kland Ca 94612





Oak) chayst 400s

RETURN RECEIVESTES U.S. Clerk office

